

12-27-06

Friends don't let friends
use nuclear weapons

Neither in attacks nor in threat.

PLA

Hidden crisis, as is 1964 + 2002

This time, ~~crisis~~ + open threats

Wg the "hidden"?

1. No gov or public challenge, in debate
(to "option"?)

no issue is whether in PSR

(attention on frag? (not promising!
policy; not counts there

2. Who can stop it - how probs?

2/ Does in Agencies - won't, as if new

c) ask for this

b) European public / or gov

notably difficulties in 2002-03: Wg?

US + c) Euro banks, of does like DSM

Does is just, over-confident

Wrong

US can't ^{about} stop frag, election, lots
don't ^{attacks} won't, after liberal

Euro explicitly is to, condition

frag / option

from sanctions (will it
work?)

what if US attacks - not from experts

RCA?

I have warm feelings to express, but
doubt all of us, if our new working toward another world, a better
3 ~~unhappy~~ ~~prospects~~ world, though in my case,
trying to avert a much
worse world.

Undoubtedly, even after the change in Congress,
the departure of Rumsfeld, and the Baker Commission
Report,

A balance in the next 2 years, at least,
it is more likely than not that our ^{already occupation} ~~war~~ in
Iraq will continue

(More than half US troops will
remain: more likely to be more than
now ^{next year} than to be less!)

2) US support of Israeli ^{illegal} occupation of the
West Bank will continue

- and 3) Bush & Cheney will attack Iran, possibly
escalating eventually to use of nuclear weapons
against underground sites.

I focus on the last ^{policy}, because I think it is
the most susceptible to big changes of ^{of the domestic Bush-Cheney policies} pol. pressure.

In the US, I call for unorthodox truth-telling, warning
WS on the scale of the PP, but before the new war.
about internal contradictions and official calculations
of the consequences of such a step, and alternatives.

On the issue of the Atlantic, it urges members
to press their governments to make all decisions
concerning now to the US

1) that talk of a US nuclear "option" is entirely
~~quite~~ ^{absolutely} unacceptable, that nuclear EU threats
are unacceptable if any nation under any circumstances
the committee are. known

2) that no European basis, uniform or co-ord. ~~is~~
is available for an attack on the US
with or without the aid of other nations.

3) In the event of a US air attack on the
US, or of a threat with capability of US,
these governments ~~will~~ will feel compelled
to withdraw from alliance with the US,
i.e. to leave NATO.

"30 min."
(Surrender seminar)

note: "US has used nukes on
occasions
(+ 50, ...)

Importance of stopping proliferation while
1) using nukes, both in threats and execution of
threats — ~~is~~ providing example of self-
exemption from any ^{too} restraint, multiplying
and 2) is to deny, encouraging enemies to grab
nukes, both for deterrence
and to use as RV threats or attacks

only hope of de-legitimizing acquisition
or use; an immoral + illegal example,
precedent: LIKEWISE "counter-prolif", (see 2)
esp. but not only by nukes (1)

36-100?

UN Res. 3160 should now get universal
support: US, NATO

(+ Israel (ba), Pak (ba) India

abol. Inst and Art. VI at least be implemented
Violation cease, by NWS, above all,
US + Russia

tell Kneegon (and Armstrong)

Leverage on

US :

W NATO ~~as~~ NRC
MP-II

or NATO dissolves

or excludes US

(at least: Norway, Denmark,
Netherlands, Spain, (Greece), brief
study?
[What is France on

EU? UK?

CANADA

Germany - new

(AUS

Middle
Power...

(Pol, Is, NO

India? China?

Russia - again

(Iran? Iraq? Gulf? Want EU!!

TR: Urgent to
stop Iran by means
alt the attack:

ME we are race!

(NK — Asian are
race:

India should have
been stopped? Oris
(Clinton's?) CIA really
fail that badly?

12-24-06

Bush, having
allowed profits
to exist, encouraged
it —

then was it
to justify & rationalize
policies (on pretense
of stopping profits)
that increase it.

DITTO on Thru

How about: ^{recess} deficits/
tax cuts ...

(Has he helped
gangs, yet? ^{have?}
women? blocks?
(is trying not to)

as he has,
thousands pro-
* proliferators.
Muslims (Islamists)

(police specifically
enlarge Israel;
act far from democracy
in Iraq (ME? :/)

Have he made
business, floods
more likely, by
his poor - Natural
policies? (What are
there?)

12-24-06

[Stopping US from
using

- getting the out
of our hands -
is so/much
important as anything
else

- Avoid the getting/
for/ we can never
in ME

(Can the be stopped
without to do? Hopefully)

Birthing point:

- ^{strong} Shunts on from (40, 100)
- from programs, issue
- no Shunts on NK
- Indian deal Senate ^{OK}
(hard work finally)

TIPPING POINT:

Half & totals yesterday

12-11-06

(Next (Elems):

12-9-06

Require for the
actually-existing

NPT

substantive proof and

(as Ant DT ; no NEU

(Ant arg. sec. assurance
"Unes of Berlin, NATO,
(Israel) + US "world-wide
responsibilities" (ME, SEA)

US rem against India
(see 1964) or Israel
(or Pak - usually)
(or Iran, Iraq under old
management)
(Japan)

Waiting. Time ~~for~~
Hurry to get off
the tiger's back

Abol. Fast

now EU / US

Either (MP-II) part,

now — pushed by

non-US : NATO,

old Europe / Sweden

(Japan?) South Africa,

Cameroon, Middle

Panama (Kabon? Hurray?)

(not, Iron-) OR

(India deal (next week?))

See threats

& Program

So. threats

from FU.

Testing

(UK, India, Pak. --

France, China --

Small chance : but

what is cost of
trying? GWS will be
washed (!)

Iran : Program Anti

NDI + INSPECTION (independ)

Kafe

12-9-08
Answer

I am skeptical of
"promising punishment/
threat" as deterrent
to war crimes

ICC, etc.

Co. committing oneself
to withdrawal/
induction of collabor-
ation

NVR

not just, I condemn,
but I will not permit,
I will obstruct

I/you will no longer be
"we" (new identities)

It's now:

How to org. human
rights, etc

with US, for new...

then in regime action

(see CIA report conf. ...)

1964-65

Sall: "Once on
the tiger's back,
you may not be able
to push the tree to
get off."

(But he got on, behind
LBJ

like NATO/US

Time

12-20-06

ASK:

AIDS

Waring

Parents

Female Education

(Without US - donor)

Ques

✓ (What can be done without / against US?

Movement to de-legitimize wars, FU

of some NWS, or allies: NATO, (minus many?)
W1?

How does UK actually justify money for
Britain? or FU?

Latin

America

China?

What will Russia

use war?

✓ If there can be an anti-Holocaust Symposium,

CAN'T SOME STATES HOST ANTI-NUC

PROGRAMS — for Mutual Security... ANTI-US —

SOUTH AFRICA;

the Caribbean, Middle East, Persia, Univ. Argentina....

INTERVENTION
(ALTERN.)

12-20-06

After-look

What would it have taken —
who might have done what?
and why didn't it happen?

to: Avert Civil War (and slavery
with the CW)

WWI

avert or end VN

" WWII Holocaust...

NUC BUILDUP

(SIB)

global warming (Kathryn)

AIDS

harmful, famine

genocidal civil wars

12-13-06

1 NATO should be totally de-nuclearized

2 No nukes in Europe

That includes UK, France, and US-in-Europe
(ships, planes)

36-100 3 Plans for NFE worldwide (China Taiwan)

(That includes Is, India, Pak, NK, Russia

US UNILATERAL

(UK, F)

US

(End" of Europe)

Full inspection

No prod. of fissile material.

all existing work to be into inspection

"Sunlight/glass"

|| PUBLICATION (auth or not) of all
|| past and war plans + commit

"You ought to put those out."

(Study/expose STASI ops)

12-25-06

Implications of New Winter:

a) reduce each arsenal by a factor of
100 — from 15,000⁺ down to ~150 or less

15000
150

b) no city attacks (unless most accurate,
most reliable, nuclear
number of warheads & us.)

~~changes~~

1951-52

Considering effects of H-bombs:

1) no H-bomb test ban, inspection
or, very small number;

2) no ground bursts

3) no

4) no ICBM (nuclear test ban
no H

FIRE?

NFC:

You can't move toward the direction of
and prolif
while using the weapons

(and taking steps to increase or maintain
availability)

The real reason for large arsenals,
retention

modernization, "overkill"

(~~was~~ was Edm - not for Type I Det.)

Smith: you can't both prepare for war
and avoid war (minimize chance of it?)
?

Is it defensive war? NO?

Reverend:

If you want empire (+ power) prepare
for war.

So vis

12-25-86

(Part ^{time} in dot-tube)

Indirectly/alone ~~is~~ a "coalition of the unwilling" (to launch new war
or to encourage
or to fail to reduce the risk
movings)

in NATO

to demand a change to NEU and
abandonment of Art. VI

or leave NATO Not

Belgium?
Luxembourg?

Norway, Denmark, Holland, (Sweden), Spain, CANADA,
Italy; GERMANY; ~~FRANCE~~ (does paper really have
any weight for new or EU-umbrella?)

US - UK? No SR? France? No! (Hurry!)

(China + SU forced serious EU threats: do they now?)

do they need 2nd strike deterrent?

Would US - with mutual deterrent?

As, Pol has a built up, with some basis, for EU threat.
(India?!)

What/whose interests are balanced several by
US/R about?

(Usually someone has a reason to do something
abnormal dangerous - or to fail to reduce danger;
what is it, here?)